

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 28 2006

212/656

Remarks

Claims 1 through 5, 7 through 21, 23 through 32, 35 and 37 through 53 remain pending in the application.

The claims have been amended to cure the indefiniteness identified by the Examiner. Claim 35 is amended to delete a redundant recitation and other matters of form.

The Office Action rejects the claims as obvious over Zampese, Purchase Management System And Method, U.S Patent 6,104,650 (Jan. 11, 2000) under the assertion that Zampese discloses the use of a plurality of codes for use in connecting various terminals, and that downloading access codes over the internet is old and well-known.

The rejection ignores limitations of the claims. Claim 1 requires provision of additional access codes upon an initial mismatch of access codes. Zampese clearly terminates operation after a single failure, as he clearly explains in reference to his Fig. 3. Provision of additional access codes upon an initial mismatch of access codes is clearly contrary to Zampese, and non-obvious over both his explicit teaching to mail access codes to users and his explicit teaching to terminate a transaction after a single mismatch.

Zampese teaches against the claimed combination. Zampese bluntly and explicitly teaches against internet download of access codes. Zampese explicitly states "When purchases are made via a computerized network such as the internet, the step of providing the set of unique transaction codes to the purchaser includes supplying the transaction codes to the

212/656

purchaser via a medium external to the computerized network (e.g., via the mail) to prevent fraudulent interception of the transaction codes." Zampese also states "In the preferred embodiment, although the account code may be forwarded to the purchaser over the internet, the series of secret transaction codes 32-37 are not. Instead, they are provided to the purchaser via the mail or in person via secure non-internet channel 17, FIG. 1." Zampese clearly teaches that access codes are to be transmitted through the mail.

The Examiner mistakenly takes official notice of the purported fact that internet download of access codes in a software verification program is well known. The examiners assertion is cast in the present tense, and it thus irrelevant to the issue of whether the practice was well known at the time of filing. There is no evidence that the practice is well-known even today (for example, the USPTO private pair system, as of 2006, transmits the reference codes necessary to verify a user through the mail). The assertion is also made without any evidentiary support. Applicant requests that the Examiner explicitly set forth specific facts predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support the proposition that internet download of access codes in a software verification program is well know.

The motivations identified by the Examiner would not lead one of skill in the art to make the modifications of the claimed invention. The examiner identifies user friendliness as a motivation. Such a motivation does not suggest any particular modifications. Security precautions typically used by internet banks and internet stores entail a modicum of user burden, including (overwhelmingly) the use of mailed access codes, and

212/656

this system is not user friendly. It results in days or weeks of delay between initiating a transaction and completing the transaction (the USPTO's private pair system is just one current example). User friendliness is merely one of many factors driving practices used to secure internet transactions, and the assertion of this motivation to the exclusion of clearly countervailing motivations to enhance security, is clearly suggested by hindsight in light of the claimed invention. It is clear that the art favors burdensome off-internet channels for providing access codes, even today. Likewise, convenience to the user is a motivation that leads to no certain modifications to Zampese. Zampese himself asserts that his system is convenient, and disparages encryption as inconvenient. Combining the Examiner's motivation of convenience and Zampese's teaching that encryption is "less than successful" would lead to the abandonment of encryption. Clearly, this demonstrates that convenience, as a motivation considered alone, provides no suggestion to make sensible modifications of Zampese.

Conclusion

This response has addressed all of the Examiner's grounds for rejection. The rejections based on prior art have been traversed. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

Date: September 28, 2006

By:



K. David Crockett, Esq.
Reg. No. 34311